

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

JJGJ	R.:	06-	0

Paper No:

COPY MAILED

QUALCOMM, INC 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO CA 92121

JUN 1 9 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Hsu : DECISION

Application No.: 10/051,777 :

Filing Date:16 January, 2002 : Attorney Docket No. 020104 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 12 April, 2006, to revive the instant application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having as abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 5 October, 2005, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 5 January, 2006;
- the application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 5 January, 2006;
- it does not appear that the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment before the instant petition was filed;
- on 12 April, 2006, Petitioner filed with the instant petition (with fee) a reply in the form of an amendment, but failed to make the statement ("...the entire delay ... from the due

Application No.: 10/051,777

date of the reply to the filing of a grantable petition ... was unintentional ...") nor showing of unintentional delay (docket records)—however, the petition is read to so state, and Petitioner hereby is placed on notice that, under his duty of candor to the Office he must notify the Office is this reading is incorrect.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).²

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.³

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.⁴ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁵ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁶ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under <u>Pratt</u>, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

² 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

³⁵ U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

Therefore, by example, an <u>unavoidable</u> delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

⁴ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁵ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁶ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

Application No.: 10/051,777

(By contrast, <u>unintentional</u> delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, <u>and</u> also, by definition, are not intentional.⁷))

Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a statement/showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed before 8 June, 1995. Petitioner may review the commentary set forth at MPEP §711.03(c) and the language at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) for guidance.

The requirements for relief under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are: petition, fee, reply, showing of unintentional delay, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee.

It appears that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

CONCLUSION

Because Petitioner appears to have satisfied the regulatory requirements, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The application is released to the Examiner in Technology Center 2600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning <u>this decision</u> may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.

John J. Gillon, Jr. Senior Attorney Office of Petitions

Therefore, by example, an <u>unintentional</u> delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are <u>to be</u> prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.